

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
POPULATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 25, 2010
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Ave, Phoenix

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley, Chair
Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Vice Chair
*Bryant Powell, Apache Junction
A- Andrea Marquez, Buckeye
*DJ Stapley, Carefree
A- Ian Cordwell for Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek
Jason Crampton, Chandler
*Mark Smith, El Mirage
*Eugene Slechta, Fountain Hills
*Terry Yergan, Gila River Indian Community
Thomas Ritz, Glendale
*Katie Wilken, Goodyear
*Gino Turrubiarres, Guadalupe

*Rick Buss, Town of Gila Bend
Linda Edwards for Kyle Mieras, Gilbert
*Sonny Culbreth, Litchfield Park
John Verdugo for Matt Holm, Maricopa County
*Wahid Alam, Mesa
A- Ed Boik, Peoria
Chris DePerro, Phoenix
Dave Williams, Queen Creek
*Bryan Meyers,
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
A-Eddie Lamperez, Scottsdale
A-Arlene Palisoc for Lisa Collins, Tempe
Anne McCracken, Valley Metro
*Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown

* Not in attendance

A - Participated via audioconference

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Jami Garrison, MAG
Jason Howard, MAG
Anubhav Bagley, MAG
Rita Walton, MAG
Jesse Ayers, MAG
Max Enterline, Phoenix

Maria Hyatt, Phoenix
A- Lloyd Abrams, Surprise
Eric Morgan, Avondale
Sam Andrea, Chandler
David de la Torre, Chandler

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 by the Chair, Jim Bacon.

2. Call to the Audience

No comments were made by the audience.

3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes of April 27, 2010

Charlie McClendon moved, Dave Williams seconded and it was unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of April 27, 2010.

4. Census 2010 Updates

4a. Phoenix Complete Count Committee (CCC)

Maria Hyatt, City of Phoenix, reported that the Phoenix Complete Count Committee had been given the option to sunset since most Census 2010 activities have wrapped up, but the CCC chose to continue on to assist with Non Response Follow Up (NRFU). The CCC is ready and willing to assist the Census Bureau in getting out in the neighborhoods to assist with the NRFU. Ms. Hyatt reported that the CCC has completed distribution of door hangers in the hard to count and low 2010 participation rate areas of Phoenix. She passed out samples of the door hangers which have information on why the Census is important. Ms. Hyatt pointed out that the door hangers were funded by donations from State Farm and Wells Fargo, whose logos are also on the door hangers. City did not put their logo on the door hangers in order to allay any fears of “government” being involved and to further assure confidentiality for all respondents.

4b. "Count to '10" Census Outreach Group

Rita Walton, MAG, provided an update for Kelly Taft, MAG Communications Manager, who was unable to attend due to a schedule conflict. Rita reported the following items from the MAG Count to 10 Census Outreach Group:

- Now that we are in the Non-Response Follow Up phase, the focus of census messages has shifted to getting residents to open their doors and voluntarily provide information to census takers. The message on the remaining print ads that are finishing up their runs is: “Opening your door to the census taker opens doors for your community.”
- The group did report some good news as overall mail back response rates increased in Maricopa County compared to the 2000 Census, from 69% in 2000 to 70 percent in 2010. This was especially noteworthy when considering Arizona’s current economic and political climate.
- While in terms of percentages, Pima County fared better than Maricopa County, with a participation rate of 71%, that is a drop for them from their 2000 rate of 73%. The state of Arizona as a whole also came in a little bit lower than its 2000 rate of 68% with a 2010 rate one percentage point lower at 67%.
- At its May meeting, the Count to '10 group did discuss lessons learned during the 2010 Census. Some of the successes include:
 - o The approval by the Federal Highway Administration to allow MAG to use its federal planning funds to defray the cost of a regional media buy enabled the cities to launch a robust regional advertising campaign that they likely wouldn’t have been able to afford otherwise.
 - o The U.S. Census Bureau’s Partner Support Program, which allowed cities to submit projects for funding, was well utilized in the region and was deemed to be very helpful to the cities’ outreach efforts. Also seen as significant was the excellent partnership and cooperation received by the U.S. Census Bureau Partnership Specialists assigned to our region.
 - o Having a forum to share ideas, best practices and resources was also seen as very helpful.

- o The national web site, the regional Census Web site maintained by MAG, and the individual city census web pages were considered to be very helpful to members of the public and the media.
- On the “opportunities for improvement” side of things:
 - o A big issue for our region seemed to be a high number of calls from people who didn’t receive their forms in the mail. People who called the Bureau’s help line for forms were told to call back after April 12th to request a form. Unfortunately, the cutoff for Non-Response Follow Up was April 16th, which left too small of a window for residents to request replacement forms.
 - o The group discussed how their might be better management of collateral materials – which should be produced sooner so distribution can occur in a timely fashion.
 - o Also noted were some issues with some of the Questionnaire Assistance sites being in hard to find locations.
- The group will continue its discussion at its final meeting, probably sometime in July. In the meantime, plans are underway to find methods for thanking the many volunteers and members of Complete Count Committees who worked so hard on this effort.

4c. Timeline of Census Activities

Jami Garrison referred to the timeline spreadsheet in the agenda packet as Attachment One. She said that MAG staff continue to monitor and work with the Census Bureau to ensure MAG member agencies are aware of and meet any deadlines in order to obtain an accurate and complete count for the 2010 Census. She said that there have been no changes to the timeline since last month. She pointed out that with the major Census 2010 count activities winding down that the Local Census Offices are working on the Non Response Follow Up (NRFU) as reported by Maria Hyatt earlier. She said that the NRFU will continue through the month of June and end on July 1 so member agencies can expect Census takers in their communities until then.

Ms. Garrison also said that the State of Arizona has been asked to participate in a review of major group quarters (GQ) and has asked for assistance from the Councils of Governments. MAG is therefore requesting member agency support to provide the necessary GQ information. She indicated that it is not necessary for member agencies to participate in this review but if they would like to confirm there GQ with the Census Bureau, input must be received by MAG no later than June 16. Ms. Garrison added that the purpose of the review will be to first identify any missing Gqs from the 2010 Census results or GQs that are in the wrong census block and then provide information so that a correction can be made. Jami Garrison said that she would be emailing additional details to all POPTAC members by the end of the week.

4d. Census Technical Activities Debriefing

Jami Garrison reported that in preparing for the 2010 Census MAG staff worked closely with member agency staff and Census Bureau staff to assist the Bureau in getting the best count possible for the region. She referred to the handout “Geography Counts...” which has a summary of the

various census technical activities that member agencies worked on and MAG assisted with. Timelines for each program were also listed in the handout.

Ms. Garrison said that now that the bulk of these programs have wrapped up, MAG is asking member agencies for feedback on what worked well or even what could have been improved. She said that anyone wanting to share feedback today could do so or can send information to her via email later. MAG staff will compile the information and report back at the next meeting as well as forward any pertinent information to the Census Bureau. This feedback will also be kept on file for when planning efforts get underway for the next decennial census.

There were no additional comments.

5. Data Collection Update

5a. Land Use Data Collection

Jason Howard, MAG, reported that MAG is currently in the process of reviewing current land use datasets. He said that all member agencies should have been contacted regarding this update. If you have not been contacted, Mr. Howard asked that you contact him directly so that he can get you the land use review information. He said there are only a two member agencies that have not reported back on the existing land use review. He indicated that if MAG does not hear back from these two, that we will assume the existing land use data is okay as is. He said that MAG would like to complete this dataset by the end of the month.

Mr. Howard referred to a handout title “MAG Existing Land Use Summary” which provided area land use estimates based on the data that was sent out for review. He said that the information on the hand out does not reflect information that has been reported from the review of the data. Although, as he also pointed out, the reported changes do not appear to change these numbers too much. He said that areas known as ‘developing’ are proving to be the most challenging as defining ‘developing’ versus ‘vacant’ is at times questionable.

Jason Howard added that draft development areas database will be forthcoming for review. It is currently in process and expected to be distributed for review in June.

Mr. Howard wrapped up his report by announcing that there are maps on display in the room that depict the draft Land Use data.

Thomas Ritz, Glendale, asked for clarification on the information in the handout “MAG Existing Land Use Summary.” The handout has “May 2010” on it, so does it reflect the pre-review data or something more current? Jason Howard said that yes, it is a draft document and does not reflect updates to the data from review documents that have been submitted to date.

5b. Mixed-Use Land Use Review

Jason Howard said that MAG staff maintain a set of codes for all the land use datasets so that a common code can be applied throughout. In 2009 MAG staff updated the land use codes with member agency input for single-use land uses. MAG staff would now like to confirm mixed-use classifications from MAG member agencies. Member agencies have been requested to confirm and provide input on the classifications. These data were sent out earlier in the month to all member agencies. Mr. Howard said that if anyone had not received communication regarding mixed-use land use to please let him know.

Jason Howard then referred members to a handout showing a sample document from the mixed-use land use review packet they received previously. He said that member agencies are asked to review sheet number 2 from the review packet. Members are asked to review the accuracy of the MAG land use codes assigned to each mixed-use land use category, the percentages within each category and the density of the ranges. Members are also requested to indicate in the field labeled "Locational Substitution By Model Allowed?" whether or not the MAG model can substitute values from a locational estimate or proportion. This is only applicable to the area categories for "Downtown," "Freeway," "Airport," and "Railroad." The estimate proportions are shown in a second slide and handout provided by Jason. He said that these are based on a region-wide analysis of mixed-use areas that was conducted for the 2007 Socioeconomic Projections.

Jason thanked the members for the information that has been received to date.

5c. Employer Database

Jami Garrison MAG provided an update on the employer database that MAG has been maintaining over the years. She said that MAG has completed a draft version of the 2009 Employer Database which is an important input for the MAG Socioeconomic Projections.

She provided a handout showing a few facts about the current database. The handout showed the change in records from the 2007 database to the draft 2009 database. She noted that increases shown are more likely due to continued improvements in the data and not necessarily due to actual increase in employed persons or employers, especially given the current economic conditions. Ms. Garrison noted the 20% increase in records that have been geocoded to a parcel will help with locational analysis. The data continue to improve and member agency review of the 2009 draft data will help towards this end.

Ms. Garrison noted that all member agencies should have received a copy of the employer database for their MPA. She said that MAG is requesting that each member review the data and make corrections and/or additions to the spreadsheet, highlighting them with red font. She provided a sample document for review. MAG is requesting that member agencies provide any revisions by Friday, May 28, 2010. Ms. Garrison then referred to another hand out which provided answers to some frequently asked questions. She reminded members that the review data they have received covers their entire Municipal Planning Area but that they are not required to review records that fall outside the jurisdictional boundaries. She said that a few agencies have used their business license data to update their records and suggested that if others wish to do the same thing, it may prove helpful in their review. She encouraged member agencies to update the data that they could and if they had data available but were short staff for the review/comparison to contact her directly and MAG staff may be able to help in that regard.

Jim Bacon asked to whom in the member agencies were the Employer Database draft documents sent for review. Jami Garrison responded that each POPTAC member should have received an email with the draft documents for their review. Or, if they were not the contact listed for this review, they should have been copied on the email request. She said that if anyone had specific questions as to who in their agency was sent the review documents, to contact her directly. She said she has a sheet that tracks the documents sent out for review.

Andrea Marquez, Buckeye, said that Buckeye had geocoded their employer data and asked if this information would be useful for MAG. Jami Garrison replied that yes, it would be useful. She said that MAG also has the data geocoded and could provide shapefiles for any of the data that is

distributed. This was sent out as spreadsheets to make it easier to highlight the changes. Ms. Marquez said that it would be useful to see the MAG shapefile as well. Jami Garrison said that she would follow-up with Ms. Marquez after the meeting to coordinate the data. Ms. Garrison also asked that any other member who wished to have a shapefile of the draft employer database contact her directly after the meeting and she could provide that to them.

Max Enterline, Phoenix, asked if trends could be established using the older employer database compared to the newer 2009 draft employer database. Rita Walton, MAG, said that yes, analysis could be done comparing the two datasets, however to be cautious of the data. She said that whenever MAG finds a new business it gets added in to the data. Ms. Walton said that data has not been purposely left out or omitted but the assumption is that the data continues to improve from the source. She said that the numbers for employees for individual companies can be compared and MAG feels these numbers are the best available at this time, but getting better and may be updated as member agencies go through their review. She said, however, to use caution.

Jami Garrison added that since we often do not get timely information on business closings so that could also cause some overstatement of the data. Again, she emphasized to use caution and trends can be reviewed as long as you know the limitations of the data.

5d. Data Collection Timeline and Update

Jami Garrison reported that attachment two in the agenda packet is an updated draft timeline of non-census data collection activities. She pointed out that the “due date” column has been split into two new columns: “member agency due date” and “MAG due date.” This will help members and MAG staff to keep informed on what data items are coming due. She said that there have been no additions to the timeline since the last meeting, just the updated formatting.

6. Preparation for 2012 Socioeconomic Projections: AZ-SMART

Anubhav Bagley gave a presentation on MAG’s next generation socioeconomic modeling tool: Arizona’s Socioeconomic Modeling Analysis and Reporting Toolset, or AZ-SMART. He said that Phase 1 of the tool was completed in 2008 and is currently being tested. His presentation provided an overview of the model with details on the model, data needs, its current status, and future steps for the process.

Jim Bacon asked if a copy of the presentation would be made available. Anubhav Bagley responded that MAG is setting up a page on the MAG website dedicated to the AZ-SMART project. He also added that a copy of the presentation is available on the MAG website in the POPTAC Committee section for the May meeting. Rita Walton added that information from all the projects that MAG staff are working on and that relate to POPTAC can also be found the POPTAC page of the MAG website.

7. Regional Updates

Jim Bacon reminded everyone of the new law that went into effect extending the General Plan updated deadline to 2015. However, he said that for his community, the Town of Paradise Valley, wants to move ahead with an update to their General Plan and will most likely start that this fall with the intention of finishing it up sometime next year.

8. Next Meeting of the MAG POPTAC

Chairman Jim Bacon said the next meeting of the MAG POPTAC is scheduled for Tuesday, June 22, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.